



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/993,779

11/05/2001

Hakan Ozdemir

01-S-046 (1678-48)

7603

30431

7590

05/26/2004

STMICROELECTRONICS, INC.
MAIL STATION 2346
1310 ELECTRONICS DRIVE
CARROLLTON, TX 75006

EXAMINER

RODRIGUEZ, GLENDA P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2651

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,779

Applicant(s)

OZDEMIR, HAKAN

Examiner

Glenda P. Rodriguez

Art Unit

2651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/12/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2651

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. "Second Viterbi detector" is a critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). "Second Viterbi detector" is used for further detection of the read back signal. Examiner maintains its rejection because if the feature is being claimed by the Applicant, the Claimed limitation must be included in the specification in order to be claimed. Examiner cannot concur with the Applicant because according to the Claimed invention, the Claim is using two different Viterbi detectors, but according the Applicant's argument and Figs. 5-6 and paragraph [28], L. 25-27 only one Viterbi detector is being used in the invention and not two Viterbi detectors are being used according the Claim language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2651

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reed et al. (US Patent No. 6, 144, 513).

Regarding Claim 1, Reed et al. teach a head-connection-polarity detector, comprising:

A circuit operable to recover servo data from a servo signal generated by a read-write head that is coupled to the circuit with a connection polarity (Col. 4, Lines 54-67. Reed et al. teach a circuit that receives inputted data from the head and detects the polarity of the servo signal from that data.);

And a determinator coupled to the circuit and operable to determine the connection polarity from the recovered servo data (Col. 4, Lines 54-67 and Col. 11, Lines 54-67.

Reed et al. teach of a circuit that determines if the polarity pulses are positive or negative.).

Regarding Claim 2, Reed et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 1. Reed et al. further teach the circuit is operable to recover a servo-synchronization mark from the servo signal (Col. 4, Lines 54-67 and Col. 7, Lines 33-38 and Col. 9, Lines 50-59. Reed et al. teach a circuit that receives inputted data from the head and detects the polarity of the servo signal from that data.); and the determinator is operable to determine the connection polarity from the recovered servo-synchronization mark (Col. 4, Lines 54-67 and Col. 11, Lines 54-67. Reed et al. teach of a circuit that determines if the polarity pulses are positive or negative.).

Regarding Claim 3, Reed et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 1. Reed et al. further teach wherein the determinator is operable to generate a signal that indicates the determined connection polarity (Col. 11, Lines 54-67. Reed et al. teach a SBIT_n signal being high when a positive polarity signal is detected and SBIT_n being low when it is a negative pulse.).

Art Unit: 2651

Regarding Claim 4, Reed et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 1. Reed et al. further teach wherein the circuit comprises a Viterbi detector (Col. 4, Line 67 to Col. 5, Line 3).

Regarding Claim 5, Reed et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 1. Reed et al. teach wherein the circuit is operable to recover the servo data from the servo signal regardless of the connection polarity (Col. 12, Lines 6-13).

Regarding Claim 49, Reed et al. teach a method, comprising:

Sampling a servo signal having a phase (See Abstract and Col. 11, Lines 39-61);

And recovering servo data from the servo signal regardless of the phase of the servo signal (Col. 11, Lines 39-61).

Claim 21, 22, 23, 27, 28-33, 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tuttle et al. (US Patent No. 6, 108, 151).

Regarding Claim 21, Tuttle et al. teach a synchronization-and-head-connection polarity detector, comprising:

A Viterbi detector operable to recover a synchronization mark from samples of the servo signal generated by a read head that is coupled to the Viterbi detector with a connection polarity (Col. 20, Lines 15-22. Tuttle et al. teach that the Viterbi detector could also be used for synchronously detecting data.);

A comparator coupled to the Viterbi detector and operable to determine the connection polarity from the recovered synchronization mark (Col. 19, Line 65 to Col. 20, Line 11.

Tuttle et al. teaches that the device detects if the pulse is positive or negative.).

Regarding Claim 22, Tuttle et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 21. Tuttle et al. further teach wherein the comparator is operable to generate a signal that indicates the determined

Art Unit: 2651

connection polarity (Col. 19, Line 65 to Col. 20, Line 11. Reed et al. teach a $SBIT_n$ signal being high when a positive polarity signal is detected and $SBIT_n$ being low when it is a negative pulse.).

Regarding Claim 23, Tuttle et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 21. Tuttle further teach wherein the Viterbi detector is operable to recover the synchronization mark from the servo signal regardless of the connection polarity of the read head (Col. 20, Lines 17-22).

Regarding Claim 27 and 33, Tuttle et al. teach a servo channel, comprising:

A sampling circuit coupled to receive and operable to generate samples of a servo signal that represents a servo-synchronization mark and that has a phase (Col. 8, Lines 48-51 and Lines 56-59);

And a synchronization-mark-and-polarity detector coupled to the sampling circuit and comprising,

A first Viterbi detector operable to recover the synchronization mark from the samples of the servo signal (Col. 20, Lines 15-22. Tuttle et al. teach that the Viterbi detector could also be used for synchronously detecting data.);

And a comparator coupled to the first Viterbi detector and operable to determine the phase of the servo signal from the recovered synchronization mark (Col. 19, Line 65 to Col. 20, Line 11. Tuttle et al. teaches that the device detects if the pulse is positive or negative.).

Regarding Claim 28, Tuttle et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 27. Tuttle et al. further teach the comparator is coupled to the sampling circuit and the sampling circuit is operable to generate the samples of the servo signal having a desired phase (Col. 8, Lines 48-51 and Lines

Art Unit: 2651

56-59 and Col. 19, Line 65 to Col. 20, Line 11. Tuttle et al. teaches that the device detects if the pulse is positive or negative.).

Regarding Claim 29, Tuttle et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 27. Tuttle et al. further teach the comparator is coupled to the sampling circuit (Col. 19, Line 65 to Col. 20, Line 11 and Col. 8, Lines 48-51 and Lines 56-59. Tuttle et al. teaches that the device detects if the pulse is positive or negative.); and the sampling circuit is operable to generate the samples of the servo signal having a desired phase (Col. 11, Lines 30-38. Tuttle et al. teaches a phase circuit that determines the phase of the current signal, calculates a phase error and then adjusting the phase of the signal to the desired phase.).

Regarding Claim 30, Tuttle et al. teaches all the limitations of Claim 27. Tuttle et al. further teach the comparator is operable to generate a phase signal that indicates the determined phase; and the sampling circuit is coupled to the phase determinator and is operable to generate the samples of the servo signal having a desired phase in response to the phase signal (Col. 8, Lines 48-51 and Lines 56-59 and Col. 11, Lines 30-48 and 46-50).

Regarding Claim 31, Tuttle et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 27. Tuttle et al. further teach wherein the phase of the servo signal represents a connection polarity between the sampling circuit and a read head that generates the servo signal (Col. 14, Lines 16-24).

Regarding Claim 32, Tuttle et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 27. Tuttle et al. further teach comprising: wherein the servo signal also represents servo data other than the synchronization mark (Col. 6, Lines 34-37. Tuttle et al. teaches that detects user data.); and a second Viterbi detector coupled to the sampling circuit and operable to recover the other servo data from the samples of the servo signal (Col. 20, Lines 17-22 and Col. 8, Lines 48-51 and

Art Unit: 2651

Lines 56-59 and Col. 11, Lines 30-48 and 46-50. Tuttle et al. teaches that the device detects if the pulse is positive or negative.).

Regarding Claim 36, Tuttle et al. teach a disk-drive system, comprising:

A data-storage disk having a surface and operable to store a servo synchronization mark and other servo data (Col. 4, Lines 28-47);

A motor coupled to and operable to rotate the disk (It is inherent in the art that the disk is driven by a motor (also called spindle motor).);

A read head operable to generate a servo signal that has a phase and that represents the synchronization mark and the other servo data;

A read-head positioning assembly operable to move the read head over the surface of the disk (Col. 4, Lines 13-20);

And a servo channel coupled to the read head, the servo channel comprising,

A sampling circuit operable to generate samples of the servo signal and to adjust a phase of the samples to a desired value in response to a determined phase of the servo signal (Col. 8, Lines 48-51 and Lines 56-59. Tuttle et al. further teach that the read data is binary data.),

A synchronization-mark-and-coupling- -polarity detector coupled to the sampling circuit and comprising,

A first Viterbi detector operable to recover the synchronization mark from the samples of the servo signal, and a comparator coupled to the first Viterbi detector and operable to determine the phase of the servo signal from the recovered synchronization mark and to provide the determined phase to the sampling circuit (Fig. 7 and Col. 11, Lines 30-50),

Art Unit: 2651

And a second Viterbi detector coupled to the sampling circuit and operable to recover the other servo data from the samples of the servo signal (Col. 8, Line 67 to Col. 9, Line 2).

Regarding Claim 37, Tuttle et al. teach a disk-drive system, comprising:

A data-storage disk having a surface and operable to store a servo synchronization mark and other servo data (Col. 4, Lines 28-47);

A motor coupled to and operable to rotate the disk (It is inherent in the art that the disk is driven by a motor (also called spindle motor).);

A read head operable to generate a servo signal that has a phase and that represents the synchronization mark and the other servo data (Col. 15, Lines 13-30);

A read-head positioning assembly operable to move the read head over the surface of the disk (Col. 4, Lines 13-20);

And a servo channel coupled to the read head, the servo channel comprising,

A sampling circuit operable to generate samples of the servo signal (Col. 8, Lines 48-51 and Lines 56-59. Tuttle et al. further teach that the read data is binary data.),

And a Viterbi detector operable to recover the synchronization mark and other servo data from the samples of the servo signal regardless of the phase of the servo signal (Col. 20, Lines 17-22).

Regarding Claim 38, Tuttle et al. teach a method, comprising:

Generating a servo signal with a read head, the servo signal representing servo data and having a phase that represents a connection polarity of the read head (Col. 11, Lines 30-47);

Art Unit: 2651

Recovering the servo data from the servo signal (Col. 9, Line 57 to Col. 10, Line 6.

Tuttle et al. teach a read channel that reads servo data.);

And determining the phase of the servo signal from the recovered servo data (Col. 11, Lines 30-47).

Regarding Claim 39, Tuttle et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 38. Tuttle et al. further teach wherein the servo data includes a synchronization mark (Col. 12, Lines 5-8); the determining comprises determining the phase of the servo signal from the recovered synchronization mark (Col. 12, Lines 49-62).

Regarding Claim 40, Tuttle et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 38. Tuttle et al. further teach further comprising generating a signal that indicates the determined phase of the servo signal (Col. 12, Lines 57-62. Tuttle et al. receives the sample and during acquisition, calculates the phase error, therefore a phase must be received in order to calculate a phase error.).

Regarding Claim 41, Tuttle et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 38. Tuttle et al. further teach comprising adjusting the phase of the servo signal to a desired value if the determined phase has an undesired value (Col. 13, Lines 17-24).

Claim 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cloke et al. (US Patent No. 5, 822, 143).

Regarding Claim 43, Cloke et al. teach a method, comprising: calculating a respective path metric for each of no more than two possible states of a binary sequence having pairs and only pairs of consecutive first logic levels and consecutive second logic levels; and determining a surviving path from the calculated path metrics, a recovered binary sequence lying along the

Art Unit: 2651

surviving path (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48, Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19).

Regarding Claim 44, Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 43. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the calculating comprises calculating a respective path metric for and only for possible binary states 00 and 11 of the binary sequence (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A).

Regarding Claims 45 and 47, Cloke et al. teach a method comprising:

Sampling a signal that represents a binary sequence having pairs and only pairs of consecutive logic 0's and logic 1's (See Fig. 1A. Cloke et al. that the servo data being manipulated is binary data.);

For each pair of samples, calculating multiple path metrics for no more than two possible states of the binary sequence (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48, Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19);

And determining a surviving path from the calculated path metrics, a recovered binary sequence lying along the surviving path (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48, Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19)..

Regarding Claim 46, Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 46. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the calculating comprises, for each pair of samples: calculating no path metrics for the possible binary states 01 and 10; and calculating multiple two metrics for each of the possible binary states 00 and 11 (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48, Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19).

Regarding Claim 48, Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 47. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the recovery circuit is operable to recover the binary sequence from the signal by:

Art Unit: 2651

for each pair of samples, calculating no path metrics for the possible binary states 01 and 10; and
for each pair of samples, calculating two respective path metrics for each of the possible binary
states 00 and 11 (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness
rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6-20, 24-26, 34, 35 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Tuttle et al. (US Patent No. 6, 108, 151) in view of Cloke et al. (US Patent No. 5, 822, 143).

Regarding Claim 6, Tuttle et al. teach a Viterbi detector, comprising:

An input terminal operable to receive a signal that represents a binary sequence having
pairs and only pairs of consecutive first logic levels and consecutive second logic levels
(It is inherent that bits are grouped into consecutive group of binary bits.);

And a recovery circuit coupled to the input terminal, the circuit operable to recover the
binary sequence from the signal by (Col. 8, Line 67 to Col. 4. Tuttle et al. teach a read
channel that recovers binary data.),

Tuttle et al. fail to teach calculating a respective path metric for each of no more than two
possible states of the binary sequence and determining a surviving path from the calculated path
metrics, the binary sequence lying along the surviving path. However, this feature is well known
in the art as disclosed by Cloke et al., wherein it teaches a Viterbi detector that uses a trellis
codes that search for a path metric (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48,

Art Unit: 2651

Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claim 7, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 6. Tuttle et al. further teach comprising:

A register coupled to the recovery circuit (Fig. 7, Elements B166(b) and Col. 10, Lines 46-49 and Col. 11, Lines 51-53);

And wherein the recovery circuit is operable to load the recovered binary sequence into the register (Fig. 7, Elements B166(b) and Col. 10, Lines 46-49 and Col. 11, Lines 51-53).

Regarding Claim 8, Tuttle and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 6. Cloke et al. further teach the first logic level equals logic 1 and the second logic level equals logic 0. (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claim 9, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 6. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the recovery circuit is operable to recover the binary sequence from the signal by calculating a respective path metric for two and only two possible states of the binary sequence (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48, Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Art Unit: 2651

Regarding Claim 10, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 6. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the recovery circuit is operable to recover the binary sequence from the signal by calculating a respective path metric for and only for possible binary states 00 and 11 (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claim 11, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 6. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the recovery circuit is operable to recover the binary sequence from the signal according to a PR4 protocol (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; Fig. 1A is the Trellis code for a Viterbi detector according to a PR4 protocol.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claim 12, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 6. Cloke et al. further teach the input terminal is operable to receive samples of the signal; and the recovery circuit is operable to process two samples at a time (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; Col. 1, Lines 55-64). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claims 13 and 17, Tuttle et al. teach a Viterbi detector, comprising:

An input terminal operable to receive samples of a signal that represents a binary sequence having pairs and only pairs of consecutive logic 0's and logic 1's (Col. 8, Lines 48-51 and Lines 56-59. Tuttle et al. further teach that the read data is binary data.);

Art Unit: 2651

And a recovery circuit coupled to the input terminal and to the register (Fig. 7, Elements B166(b) and Col. 10, Lines 46-49 and Col. 11, Lines 51-53),

Tuttle et al. fail to teach calculating a respective path metric for each of no more than two possible states of the binary sequence and determining a surviving path from the calculated path metrics, the binary sequence lying along the surviving path. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Cloke et al., wherein it teaches a Viterbi detector that uses a trellis codes that search for a path metric (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48, Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claim 14, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 13. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the recovery circuit is operable to recover the binary sequence from the signal by calculating, for each pair of samples, multiple path metrics for two of the possible binary states and only two of the possible binary states (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48, Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claim 15, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 13. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the recovery circuit is operable to recover the binary sequence from the signal by: for each pair of samples, calculating multiple path metrics for the possible binary states 00 and 11 and only the possible binary states 00 and 11 (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig.

Art Unit: 2651

1A). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claim 16, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 13. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the recovery circuit is operable to recover the binary sequence from the signal by: for each pair of samples, calculating no path metrics for the possible binary states 01 and 10; and for each pair of samples, calculating two respective path metrics for each of the possible binary states 00 and 11 (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claim 18, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 17. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the recovery circuit is operable to recover the binary sequence from the signal by calculating, for each pair of samples, the difference and only the difference between the path metrics for the two possible states (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48, Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claim 19, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 17. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the recovery circuit is operable to recover the binary sequence from the signal by calculation, for each pair of samples, of the difference between the path metrics for

Art Unit: 2651

the two possible states 00 and 11 (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claim 20, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 17. Cloke et al. further teach wherein the recovery circuit is operable to recover the binary sequence from the signal by: for each pair of samples, calculating no path metrics for or difference metric between possible binary states 01 and 10; and for each pair of samples, calculating the difference between the path metrics for possible binary states 00 and 11 (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48, Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claims 24 and 35, Tuttle et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 21 and 33, respectively. Tuttle et al. further teach:

The synchronization mark has pairs and only pairs of consecutive logic 0's and logic 1's (Col. 8, Lines 48-51 and Lines 56-59. Tuttle et al. further teach that the read data is binary data.);

And the Viterbi detector comprises,

A recovery circuit operable to recover the synchronization mark from the samples of the servo signal by (Col. 4, Lines 54-67 and Col.. 7, Lines 33-38and Col. 9, Lines 50-59.

Art Unit: 2651

Reed et al. teach a circuit that receives inputted data from the head and detects the polarity of the servo signal from that data.),

Tuttle et al. fail to teach calculating a respective path metric for each of no more than two possible states of the binary sequence and determining a surviving path from the calculated path metrics, the binary sequence lying along the surviving path. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Cloke et al., wherein it teaches a Viterbi detector that uses a trellis codes that search for a path metric (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48, Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Regarding Claims 25, 26 and 42, Tuttle et al. and Cloke et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 21 and 38, respectively. Tuttle et al. fail to teach wherein the servo data includes a synchronization mark; and the determining comprises, comparing the recovered synchronization mark to an ideal synchronization mark on a bit-by-bit basis, determining that the servo signal is in phase if the number of mismatching bits is less than or equal to a first predetermined threshold, and determining that the servo signal is out of phase if the number of mismatching bits is greater than or equal to a second predetermined threshold. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Cloke et al., wherein it teaches wherein the servo data includes a synchronization mark; and the determining comprises, comparing the recovered synchronization mark to an ideal synchronization mark on a bit-by-bit basis, determining that the servo signal is in phase if the number of mismatching bits is less than or equal to a first predetermined threshold, and determining that the servo signal is out of phase if the number of mismatching bits

Art Unit: 2651

is greater than or equal to a second predetermined threshold (Pat. No. 5, 822, 143; See Fig. 1A and Col. 1, Lines 45-48, Lines 53-59 and Col. 1, Line 60 to Col. 2, Line 19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention to use a path metric in order to effectively estimate the most likely sequence of symbols.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuttle et al. (US Patent No. 6, 108, 151) in view of Reed et al. (US Patent No. 6, 490, 110). Tuttle et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 33. Tuttle et al. fail to teach wherein: the comparator is coupled to the sampling circuit; and if the determined phase is opposite to a desired phase, then the sampling circuit is operable to invert the samples of the servo signal. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Reed et al., wherein it teaches a circuit that changes the polarity of the signal (Pat. No. 6, 490, 110; Col. 5, Lines 3-11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Tuttle et al.'s invention in order to correct the polarity for effective detection of polarity.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/12/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection done on Claim 36, Applicant argues that "the disclosure enables a servo circuit that includes only one Viterbi detector...a second Viterbi detector is not critical or essential to the practice of the invention". Applicant also argues that in Figs. 5-6 and paragraph [28], L. 25-27 demonstrates that it changes the Viterbi detector 78 and then places Viterbi detector 100 inside the Sync-polarity-detector 62. Examiner cannot concur

Art Unit: 2651

with the Applicant because according to the Claimed invention, the Claim is using two different Viterbi detectors, but according the Applicant's argument and Figs. 5-6 and paragraph [28], L. 25-27 only one Viterbi detector is being used in the invention and not two Viterbi detectors are being used according the Claim language. Examiner maintains its rejection because if the feature is being claimed by the Applicant, the Claimed limitation must be included in the specification in order to be claimed. (See MPEP 2163, The issue raised in the cases is most often phrased as whether the original application provides "adequate support" for the claims at issue or whether the material added to the specification incorporates "new matter" in violation of 35 U.S.C. 132. See, *Martin v. Mayer*, 823 F.2d 500, 503, 3 USPQ2d 1333, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Regarding Claims 1, 21, 38, Applicant argues that Reed et al.'s invention does not determine the connection polarity. Examiner cannot concur with the Applicant because as disclosed by Reed et al. in Col. 10, L. 16 to Col. 12, L. 12, Reed et al., teaches that by detecting the servo pulse, the detector has functions that determine if the pulses are inverted or non-inverted in Col. 10, L. 49 to Col. 12, L. 12 (which resemble the Applicant's disclosure of the function of the determinator as seen in paragraph [14] in the specification), therefore determining the connection polarity of the pulse in order for the read head to detect the servo data effectively as described by the Applicant in paragraphs [34] to [36] in the specification.

Regarding Claims 27, 33, 36 and 37, Applicant argues that Tuttle et al. does not suggest determining the phase of the servo signal from the synchronization mark. Examiner cannot concur with the Applicant because according to Tuttle et al. in Col. 15, L.13-63, the synchronization mark is detected by the read channel in order to then detect the phases and

Art Unit: 2651

polarities as disclosed by Tuttle et al. in Col. 18, L. 27 to Col. 20, L. 25 (in a method as disclosed by the Applicant in paragraphs [34] to [36] in the specification).

Regarding Claims 43, 45 and 47, Applicant argues that Cloke et al. fails to demonstrate developing path metrics of just two possible states. Examiner cannot concur because in Col. 4, L. 51-64 found in Cloke et al., it teaches a decode form of path metrics using the polynomial used in Cloke et al. which is in the form of $P(D) = (1+D)(1-D)^m$, wherein $m=0$, developing just two possible states.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenda P. Rodriguez whose telephone number is (703) 305-8411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday: 7:00-5:00; alternate Friday.

Art Unit: 2651


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (703) 308-4825. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



gpi

May 21, 2004.



DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600